



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Regular Meeting

Friday, April 12, 2019

1:00 AM – 5:00 PM

Van De Kamp Innovation Center
2930 Fletcher Drive, LA 90065

Executive Board Members in		Point Person Team Members		Staff	
Emilio Urioste, Burbank USD	X	Rosalinda Brewington, BUSD	X	Lanzi Asturias, Project Director	X
Veronica Montes, Culver City USD	X	Elvis Carias, CCUSD	X	Michele Stiehl, Advisor	X
Dr. Robert Miller, LACCD	X	Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen, LACCD	X	Justin Gorence, Advisor	X
Joseph Stark, Los Angeles USD	X	Men Le, LAUSD	X	Grace Ocampo, Budget Analyst	X
Alice Jacquez, Montebello USD	X	Philip Tenorio, MUSD	X	Vacant, Secretary	

1 Call to Order	1.1 Pledge of Allegiance	Rosalinda Brewington
	1.2 Approval of the Agenda Dr. Miller moved to approve the agenda, Mr. Stark seconded. Mr. Urioste, Dr. Miller, and Mr. Stark voted to approve the agenda. Ms. Montes and Ms. Jacquez were absent. The agenda was approved.	Mr. Urioste
	1.3 Approval of the Minutes a. Regular Board Meeting, March 2019 I. Dr. Miller moved to approve the minutes from the March 2019 Regular Board Meeting. Mr. Stark seconded. Under changes, Mr. Urioste noted that in item 7 on page 5, “undermarketing” should be “under the item of marketing”. II. Mr. Urioste, Dr. Miller, and Mr. Stark voted to approve the minutes. Ms. Montes and Ms. Jacquez were absent. The minutes were approved. b. Special Board Meeting, March 2019 I. Dr. Miller moved to approve the minutes from the March 2019 Special Board Meeting. Mr. Stark seconded. Ms. Jacquez arrived at 1:11 PM. Mr. Urioste, Dr. Miller, Mr. Stark, and Ms. Jacquez voted to approve the minutes. Ms. Montes was absent. The minutes were approved.	Mr. Urioste
2 Public Comment	There was no public comment.	
3 Program Updates	3.1 Budget a. Upcoming CAEP and Data and Accountability deadlines and updates I. Ms. Ocampo explained a memo from the state regarding the use of CAEP funds, and said she would be sending the latest fiscal guidelines to the board next week. II. She then gave deadline reminders for Data and Accountability reports, final budget revisions, and work plan revisions due to LARAEC and the state.	Grace Ocampo

	<p>III. She then gave reminders for Q3 progress and expense reports, and the fiscal year 2020 CAEP funds CFAD.</p>	
<p>4 Informational Items</p>	<p>I.1 Information Items</p> <p>a. LARAEC Board Meetings School Year 2019-2020 Calendar Discussion</p> <p>I. Mr. Asturias explained the LARAEC office’s recommendations for the meeting dates for 2019-2020 based on their previous history. For the August meeting, it is usually on the 3rd Friday of that month, but that Friday in 2019, 4 districts aren’t in session, so they recommend moving to the next week.</p> <p>II. Mr. Stark asked if there was a reason they could not meet quarterly instead of monthly. Dr. Miller suggested every other month; he will not be available on August 23rd, and asked if they need to have meetings in the summer at all.</p> <p>III. Ms. Montes arrived at 1:17 PM.</p> <p>IV. Mr. Asturias said that he could not think of any pressing issues; historically, they have moved to quarterly meetings, and it was felt they were not meeting enough then. He suggested meeting every other month could work better. Mr. Urioste suggested, in that case, starting in September, so that they would then have a meeting in November and an adjusted meeting in January since they don’t meet in December currently.</p> <p>V. Mr. Asturias said, if it pleased the board, that he and the LARAEC office will propose a schedule taking into account their comments, and would check with staff it that will work out given the reports that need to be filled out and submitted for board approval.</p> <p>b. Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP LARAEC Audit Plan Presentation</p> <p>I. Brandon Harrison introduced himself as a partner at VTD, and was contacted by Mr. Asturias a couple months ago when they put out a bid. There were two pieces: agreed upon procedures and and the financial statement piece. In the last few months, Mr. Asturias communicated that the board wanted to have an audit and be forthcoming with the state’s plan, and they decided they needed to adjust the audit a bit. The engagement letter is in the packet and lays out a simple plan for the agreed-upon procedures audit. Mr. Harrison then explained their methodology for collecting data and reviewing enrollment processes. He added that within the community college system the testing will be different to the other individual member districts.</p> <p>II. Miller: So we have an ftds-like calculation as well, and you’d be coming to the district office to get that information, so you’d only have one source. It’s positive attendance now, but that will probably change, so it won’t be too different from the</p>	

	<p>K12 part. Montes: We just have you doing enrollment, we haven't made decisions on funding.</p> <p>III. Stark: In terms of looking at the enrollment and pulling those numbers from a data system, we have 3 districts with a common system, LAUSD and LACCD have different ones. When we report to the state, it's through TE which is common to all 5. When we look at enrollment, are we looking at TE which is the common system, or all 3 different ones?</p> <p>IV. Harrison: We're going out to member districts and will ask how they submit their data to LARAEC, and go off that system. Miller: This will respond to the state's questions 32 and 33, to respond to that need that we had independently verified enrollment reports. Lanzi: Partially that would be the case; however, the original approach was to create a set of protocols, that have not been created yet. In April our community college is serving as the agent for this particular transaction, and it's likely this item will be part of the April board approval. At that point, we will engage with the company who will be developing the protocols. Montes: So first is enrollment, then protocol, then financial.</p> <p>V. Harrison: WE couldn't be the firm for both parts, so we communicated that to LARAEC. We would come back and do the financial statement audit, but we can't do it before the protocols part is done.</p> <p>VI. Lanzi: Wanted to add that the current audit we're discussing is in response to the board's request to verify the count at the last board meeting. That addresses item 32. A new formula would be based on enrollment or might be based on enrollment, so it's important to figure out exact enrollment.</p> <p>VII. Miller: Do you need any action from us? Lanzi: Nope, just informational.</p> <p>VIII. Jacquez: Timeline says effective or approx. April 15. Do we plan to begin procedures on April 15? Harrison: We wanted to get in guidance the board had first, but we'll finalize the engagement letter first and set up dates. It will be pretty soon. Jacquez: Just for information's sake, MUSD is starting its Spring Break.</p>	
<p>5 Board Member Reports</p>	<p>LAUSD:</p> <p>a. There was no board member report.</p>	<p>Mr. Stark</p>
	<p>BUSD:</p> <p>a. There was no board member report.</p>	<p>Mr Urioste</p>
	<p>LACCD:</p>	<p>Dr. Miller</p>

	<p>a. There was no board member report.</p>	
	<p>MUSD:</p> <p>a. There was no board member report.</p>	<p>Ms. Jacquez</p>
	<p>CCUSD:</p> <p>a. There was no board member report.</p>	<p>Ms Montes</p>
<p>6 Action Items</p>	<p>6.1 Consortia Fiscal Administration Declaration (CFAD) Approval</p> <p>a. Lanzi: This is the last board meeting we'll be having until the CFAD is due, and it enables the state to distribute funding. On page 30, there's the allocation everyone received last year plus the COLA amount, and the new total allocations. Those amounts have been entered into the state NOVA system, and it'll be the amounts that each district receives. If we have your approval to proceed, we'll reach out to member districts for certification, and that'll complete LARAEC certification.</p> <p>b. Urioste moves, Miller seconds. No discussion. Unanimous Aye vote.</p>	
<p>7 Consent Agenda</p>	<p>7.1 Capital Outlay - Burbank USD</p> <p>7.2 Capital Outlay - Montebello USD</p> <p>Mr. Urioste explained that for Burbank, the first part of the expenditures are related to preparing for the LDN program, and they are number 9 in line for approval from the nursing board. The other cost was for new, more power-saving lighting since they were experiencing growing costs for utilities.</p> <p>Dr. Miller asked if the CAEP funds were a separate pot of funding, and Ms. Montes said they were. Mr. Miller asked if this board ever entertained individual capital outlay applications from member institutions, and Ms. Montes said it was required by CAEP, and Mr. Urioste further clarified that it was coming out of their allocation.</p> <p>Ms. Jacquez explained that for MUSD, there were several repair and improvement items in their Capital Outlay, and that they have also requested a digital marquee and electric gate as well, along with a trailer replacement for a collapsed classroom.</p> <p>Mr. Stark asked LARAEC staff if there was any oversight they were responsible for in terms of this money being used. Mr. Asturias explained that the state has changed its procedures, and indicated that they need to report to them any capital outlay things that the districts want to do. The state does not approve them; they said if they have run these capital improvements by the board, then to just put the items in the minutes and then email them.</p>	

	<p>Dr. Miller explained that he does not have a problem with “approving” what his colleagues are doing, but does not know how they separate the capital outlays from their budget. Mr. Asturias explained that in essence what they understand is that each district reports capital outlays, then it gets rolled together in one. In the early days of AEBG, a comment was made that these fundings should be used for the benefit of students. Dr. Miller then confirmed for clarification that as long as the CFAD budget they just approved aligns with the individual districts’ reports and LARAEC’s reports, they are okay.</p> <p>Dr. Miller moved to approve the consent agenda, and Mr. Stark seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the consent agenda.</p> <p>There was a break from 1:47 PM to 1:58 PM before the LARAEC Executive Board Workshop.</p>	
<p>8 LARAEC Executive Board Workshop</p>	<p>a. Discuss Draft Regional Plan, including what to focus on for the next 3 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gayla Kraetsch Hartsough introduced herself and summarized her work over the last month with 75-80 individuals to develop action plans and consortium plans that build on priorities workshopped by the board. She said that she would like the workshop to be a working one and run it as a dialogue, with the aim of taking this draft document, reviewing very specific areas, and then do one more pass on the document, then adopt it at the May board meeting. ii. She explained that the state has a template to simplify the process, starting with an executive summary. Mr. Stark pointed out that the program areas in the executive summary aren’t necessarily aligned with the CAEP program areas, and he would advocate for aligning them since it’s CAEP funding. Ms. Hartsough explained that on page 19 there is a table aligned with CAEP that lists programs and sub-points. The only one it does not have is regarding pre-apprenticeship. She suggested moving the table to the executive summary if they’re comfortable. <p>b. Agree on 3-5 SMART Objectives to share with the State (order was switched around in the actual discussion of the plan from the agenda)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Ms. Hartsough explained that the smart objectives are tough because the state only wants 3-5. Regarding her meeting with Strategic Planning Group 1 today, they thought it was better to have articulation agreements or defined pathways, and they would look at the areas where pathways make sense and how adult education feed into pathways. ii. She explained that they used an example pathway for public service and law, and spent about 2 hours going over it, and the goal the group came up with was to develop at least 12 of these pathways like it over the next 3 years. They then discussed the difficulties in planning out those pathways and 	

maintaining them. She also explained that CTE ties into what the state wants as far as people getting higher-paid jobs. A lot of CTE programs lead to Bachelor's degrees, but start out at the certificate level. The programs would probably be identified with the USD's working with them.

- iii. She clarified that the pathway sheets would be different for every program and USD. The idea is to make it easier for the students and the teachers and the counselors to have one sheet and see all the opportunities at each level.
- iv. Mr. Stark addressed the next bullet, in terms of online systems such as Program Mapper and the STEP pilot; he thinks they need simplicity, focus, and coherence with LARAEC. He would like to see in this report how they can pare it down and find the sweet spots that really involve all of the LARAEC members versus individual projects.
- v. Ms. Hartsough explained the next bullet, which is basically saying to design a program for adults training to support school children to all four AE USDs. She also asked if things that all five districts do need to be in the report, and asked if all five districts were piloting STEP. Mr. Stark clarified that they are not. She advised them to stick to developing the 12 pathway models, and to make sure the districts are talking with each other and interfacing.
- vi. Dr. Miller summarized the board's feelings that they are comfortable with using the example of Program Mapper, but others aren't comfortable with mentioning the STEP pilot, and suggested saying just "online systems". Ms. Hartsough suggested just taking it out and building a model.
- vii. Ms. Jacquez expressed interest in how long it took to get the steps in the example pathway into place. She thinks the goal of 12 pathways is overly ambitious. Ms. Hartsough clarified that they are thinking in a 3-4 year period. If there are three regions, and do three a region, that would make it nine. She thinks that if they bring her back in 2022, they'll have done a lot more, but suggested making the goal nine, and make it just one objective.
- viii. She explained that the next one applies only to the 4 USD's. It has to do with priority for adults training to support school children.
- ix. After that, the next section is about serving special populations. They were very concerned about adults with disabilities. So, they did 2 pilot initiatives aimed at serving workforce entry/re-entry students, and 1 initiative aimed at serving Adults With Disabilities students. Mr. Stark added that he wants to advocate for this one, and that this is a real priority. Ms. Montes asked if this was by subregions, and Ms. Hartsough clarified it was, over three years. Ms. Montes was

worried about anything that limits the subregions, so Ms. Hartsough suggested they take it out and increase the number of initiatives.

- x. Mr. Stark suggested combining smart objectives 3 and 4 with an emphasis on serving special, vulnerable populations? He thought that orientations, counseling tools, and ISPs are great things, but they will end up having 15 different flavors of that stuff. He said he would like this to be a less-is-more thing, picking fewer goals and objectives and going deeper. Dr. Miller agreed that combining 3 and 4 would make some sense.
- xi. Ms. Montes thought the bullets in some sections are progress deliverables, and some are numbers. She would like it to be less prescriptive. Ms. Hartsough said she would have her associates come up with options, and then come back after the next break to address that.
- xii. Ms. Hartsough explained that the next objective is increased accountability through metrics, and they already have a point person team working on it. Mr. Stark asked what exactly the board thought about what they mean when they say “accountability”, and whether it’s informative or actionable. Ms. Hartsough explained that although this is called a consortium plan, it’s really a strategic plan. A best practice with strategic plans doesn’t just have smart objectives, but also overlays. She said, since they’re in their second cycle, that LARAEC needs to start looking at measurements that, since they’re a consortium, how they achieved goals better than as individual districts.
- xiii. Mr. Stark would like them to start with looking at the data points that they report to the state, because it is a data system applying to all 5 districts, and if they are overly broad, it will be a problem.
- xiv. Mr. Urioste wanted to address the “scorecard” initiative, and said it is about informing and monitoring. He suggested clarifying by notation somewhere what information is contained in that scorecard because the word “scorecard” by itself is nebulous. Mr. Stark agreed, and was concerned of how they could talk about LARAEC to their various stakeholders, and what will be their bragging points.
- xv. Dr. Miller suggested the language instead be, “establish LARAEC practices informed by baseline data that support LARAEC faculty and staff”. Mr. Stark agreed. Dr. Miller suggested changing the bullet at the end, to Mr. Urioste’s point, to “accelerate” student outcomes. Mr. Urioste asked, for clarification, if these practices could be quarterly reports that are informed by baseline data. Ms. Hartsough thought it is fine not to have measurements in the bullet points because they have not defined them yet.

- xvi. Ms. Hartsough explained that the last objective is around Professional Development. She read the category and bullet points, and Ms. Montes said that for her, the PD component is where they're engaging all the stakeholders, and she wants to see places where that brings people and subject matter experts in the field together.
- xvii. Mr. Urioste, asked, since they have a master calendar on here, will the master calendar build on test practices and evidence-based research, and Ms. Hartsough clarified that the PD will, and they can reword that section. Mr. Stark added that there should be something about student achievement on there.
- xviii. Ms. Hartsough explained that the next chapter in the regional plan is the Community Needs Assessment. She said that it would be useful to have some statistics in this report, for example how certain enrollment numbers are increasing or declining based on community circumstances: are numbers declining in some areas because potential students are afraid to enroll because they're undocumented, for example? Or are numbers declining because the economy's getting better?
- xix. She emphasized that this is why it is important for LARAEC to tell their story, and to tell the individual stories of their districts, including why enrollment is declining in some, raising in others, and what socio-economic issues are leading to it.
- xx. Ms. Hartnough then introduced the Draft Regional Plan's chapter on Vision and Accomplishments; she clarified that it isn't asked for by the state, but thinks LARAEC should include it. Ms. Montes noted there were accomplishments that were only single-district accomplishments, and asked to make sure the highlighted accomplishments were collaborative. Mr. Stark agreed. Ms. Hartsough asked for clarification, saying she was led to believe that certain accomplishments were done through LARAEC. Ms. Montes clarified that they had talked about districts doing certain projects, but it did not mean they were a LARAEC project.
- xxi. Dr. Miller said that he thought what they're supposed to put in this document is what they worked together on as a group. Ms. Hartsough said that she thought they need to brag about their accomplishments. Ms. Montes thought that Ms. Hartsough and KH Consulting have done a great job of capturing LARAEC's achievements, but was concerned about the page limit for submitting their regional plan, and whether they would go over it if they bragged about their achievements. Ms. Hartsough said that they are within the page count mandated by the state's new template, and thinks that the action plans should be internal and living documents.

- xxii. Mr. Urioste asked if Ms. Hartsough was telling them not to submit action plans as part of their overall plan submission to the state, and she confirmed this, saying it may be wise and to their benefit, because the state wants to limit them only to salient points.
- xxiii. Mr. Stark said that a lot of the narrative in there reads subjectively. He suggests creating a parallel document for other people. Ms. Hartsough clarified that some of the pages in the document do not count as part of the 35-page limit mandated by the state. Mr. Stark said that he would prefer not to get into a lot of back and forth about phrasing regarding the narrative. He would advocate for a short, compressed, streamlined version to submit.
- xxiv. There was another break from 3:20 PM to 3:31 PM.
- xxv. Ms. Hartsough introduced a proposed replacement for the specifics under the Student Success Support SMART OBJECTIVE that is more specific about the number of initiatives. Ms. Jacquez asked to decapitalize Individual Student Plans to be clear that it is a generic term.
- xxvi. Ms. Hartsough wanted to make sure the board covers the text that absolutely has to be submitted to the state, and proposed that they move over to the piloting and implementation that they have not had discussion on in chapter 7.

c. Review proposed pilots (order was switched around in the actual discussion of the plan from the agenda)

- i. Ms. Hartsough explained that the state has not asked for action plans, but have asked for what LARAEC will pilot. Their pilots were built into the action plans that were created, so they were pulled out and put into a table. There are two parts to the implementation process: part 1 is continuing the Action Planning Teams into the fall. She asked if the five planning teams made sense given their new smart objectives.
- ii. Ms. Montes thought that all of their pilots were dependent on what they changed in the smart objectives; Ms. Hartsough went through starting with the first smart objective, and explained how it is a one-to-one correlation with the first APT. The next SO is student success support, and they are proposing two APTs: one for workforce reentries, one for working with adults with disabilities. The third SO is related to metrics, and its APT is already formed and in progress. The last SO is professional development.
- iii. Ms. Hartsough made sure the board was okay with the APT's as defined by the Draft Regional Plan. Regarding piloting initiatives, per the board's wishes, she thought they could take out STEP and Program Mapper. There were no objections from the board.
- iv. Ms. Hartsough then talked about the Adults Training to Support Child School Success pilot, which is already piloting in

2 USDs, and rolling out with the rest. Mr. Stark advocated all member districts using the same terminology when it came to the program for the clarity of stakeholders. Ms. Hartsough agreed when it came to writing a document, but the state may have different standards when it comes to terminology. Mr. Stark clarified that LAUSD calls their version of the pilot the Family Success Initiative, and said that if they are developing programs, they should name them all and use the same name so it is clear to the reader. Mr. Urioste confirmed that the board is indicating that they don't have a problem with programs in development or that will be developed using that title.

- v. Ms Hartsough introduced the next pilots; on the orientation program pilot, she got a lot of feedback on wording. She felt it was important to put a LARAEC spin on orientations, and bring in other LARAEC information and how it can benefit the student.
- vi. Ms. Hartsough introduced the next section of pilots, starting with Campus Career Planning Strategy, outreach and field work opportunities. Dr. Miller suggested that at least one community college doesn't seem significant enough over a three-year period; Ms. Hartsough suggested saying at least three, and Dr. Miller agreed. He added that they should change "LARAEC partners" to "LARAEC members".
- vii. Ms. Hartsough explained the next two pilot programs, dealing with adults with disabilities, and then returned to the pilots covering students entering/reentering the workplace. She explained that it ties into smart objective 2, and that having an online platform ties in with the PD smart objective.
- viii. Ms. Hartsough asked if the board was okay with the pilots listed in their current form. Ms. Jacquez asked if they wanted to say that SME's are APT's. Ms. Stiehl explained that they wanted to restructure the SME group so they're focused on implementing and networking and communicating PD for people who can't attend a meeting, and to include more stakeholders and introduce more structure.
 - 1. Ms. Jacquez said that that's why PLC's have to be in one of those areas, and Mr. Stark agreed, saying the PLC framework is something they have strong buy-in and consensus. Ms. Hartsough agreed to make the suggested changes.
- ix. Ms. Hartsough then proceeded to walk the board through Resource Requirements, essentially the financial resource implications and possible collective bargaining needs for actions covered/suggested by the APTs and covered in the plan. She added that in the plan they don't have to tell the state about resource requirements, but they should think about initiatives they do want to invest in. The board then discussed

the various difficulties and costs the districts are facing in terms of raises, keeping staff, etc., and what grants or strategies might be used to fund initiatives like the Family Success Initiative.

d. Discuss Board initiatives to be added

e. Review the logic model

- i. Ms. Hartsough introduced the LARAEC board's self-assessment draft, attached as Document A, which will be submitted to the state, and Document B, a strategy map. Also included is their draft logic model, as asked for by the state. The logic model looks at the input and output for each strategic priority, as well as immediate, intermediate, and long-term objectives. Ms. Montes and Ms. Hartsough acknowledged that the logic model and strategic map would need to be changed to reflect new changes to the strategic plan.
- ii. Mr. Urioste asked what the purpose was for having a logic model AND Document C, which are action plans. Ms. Hartsough explained that she personally found logic models in the education field clunky, and that they believe action plans are much more powerful, even though they aren't being asked for by the state. She suggested, to avoid confusion, that they keep the action plans as a good monitoring tool, and they would have to decide whether to put them in the public strategic plan. She explained that they took components out of the action plans and arranged them in a logic model format.
- iii. Mr. Urioste asked if this requirement could be worthwhile for organizations to lobby about, and Ms. Hartsough suggested sending the strategy map and logic model to the state, then having a document they release to the public that does not include the action plans or logic plan; only the background, vision, mission, objectives, piloting, and accomplishments for LARAEC. She encouraged them to use the action plans as a living document, and suggested sitting down once a year to revisit them and think about what they've accomplished and whether they need to adjust their time frame. She would have it as a separate document for the board, APTs, deans and heads of sites, etc.
- iv. Ms. Hartsough also explained that she was tracking changes in the document, and had received a number of edits that she will make judgments on; some are typos. She asked the board how they would like her to handle edits that represent a dramatic shift in the document's thinking. Dr. Miller suggested that she send a note out to the board through Mr. Asturias, and they can convene a special meeting or conference call if the need arises.
- v. Ms. Hartsough said that it was her group's goal to get the board a final version for them to adopt in May, and suggested again that they they could give them a shorter version for the

public. Mr. Stark thought the public document may need more discussion, and does not think they need to rush it. Ms. Hartsough said that they are looking at April 26th as a target date to give the board the documents to review so they can approve them at the next meeting.

- vi. Ms. Montes reminded them that May 17 is their public meeting, and noted that their current schedule has a special meeting May 3 to go over the final document. Ms. Hartsough suggested they could just vote on the whole thing May 17, and Mr. Asturias clarified that they only had the May 3 meeting scheduled since at the time they didn't know the final due date from the state, and wanted ample time to put it into NOVA. Mr. Stark didn't think they needed a May 3 meeting if they just wanted to finalize and approve language submitted to the state.
- vii. Ms. Hartsough then went back to the first page of strategic priorities, and reviewed the adjustments to be made. She informed the board that they had no problems with the length of the document in pages currently per the state's requirements, so they should think about the amount of information they do want to put in the plan for the state.
- viii. Mr. Stark thought that their accomplishments on page 14-15 could be consolidated a bit, and the headings on page 16 clarified and simplified to highlight LARAEC's accomplishments. Ms. Montes added that some of the projects called out in that section were not LARAEC's, but individual district accomplishments. Ms. Hartsough asked who would be best suited to identify LARAEC-specific accomplishments, and Mr. Stark said the LARAEC office would be the natural choice.
- ix. Discussion moved on to the language in the strategic priorities. Mr. Stark suggested that there are some prescriptive measures proposed that may or may not be accurate and some characterizations regarding strategies, and some apparent agreements that have been made, but that may or may not be really true, depending on how partnerships are shaking out. Ms. Hartsough suggested removing the subregional reference, and said they would redo the articulation agreements into these pathway models.
- x. Ms. Montes asked, since they removed the reference to the STEP program, if that meant that strategy 1.2 should also be removed. Ms. Hartsough clarified that they have to address the sharing of information because it is part of their smart objective, and Mr. Stark thought if it was not related to their smart objective, they should take it out. Ms. Hartsough explained that their process in formulating smart objectives and goals was to start top-down, define priorities, then go

	<p>bottom-up. They first on defining the problem, the background, then defining the strategy, then defining action steps.</p> <p>xi. Dr. Miller said that what he thought he was hearing was that these strategies need to align specifically with the items in the action plan, and asked if Ms. Hartsough and the team go back and do that work, does the board need to see that before they approve it? Because the strategies and action plan items do not align yet. He emphasized that they don't want to lock themselves into statements that aren't allowed anymore legislatively.</p> <p>xii. Ms. Hartsough added that her typical experience is that organizations overestimate what they can do in the short term and underestimate what they can do in the long term. Mr. Stark thought that they might not need to have the narrative about enrollment in the document. Ms. Montes asked how they capture information about the background of LARAEC, and Mr. Stark questioned how they can present that to the public given their multiple audiences, and which internal/external document they can include that as a part of.</p> <p>xiii. Ms. Hartsough suggested that background information can be put in a separate document, and rearrange the contents about objective, goal, and strategy. She asked if it was possible for KH consulting to submit this before the board decides if they have to have a meeting on May 3rd. Mr. Asturias added that for a special meeting, the board needs 24 hours in advance, so if they could get it a week before to review the material, that would be good. Ms. Hartsough added that the good thing is, they've looked at all the tough things they need to submit to the state.</p>	
9	<p>Announcements Ms. Montes asked board members to hold May 3rd at 1:00 PM on their calendars; they will decide beforehand if the meeting is necessary. They will definitely be having a regular board meeting on May 17th.</p>	
10	<p>Ms. Montes adjourned the meeting at 5:06 PM.</p>	